

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 11-14, 17 and 18 are pending.

The claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

Claim Rejections-35 USC 112

It is indicated in the O.A. that the subject matter in claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11-14, 17 and 18, "the identification information including the specifying information is obtained in a process of existence confirmation of said devices of the other party preformed before establishment of a connection between said communication device and said devices of the other party, ... and after relating said specifying information and said identification information, said connection with said devices of the other party is able to be started by designation of said specifying information" is not supported by the Specification.

The indicated subject matter is disclosed in paragraphs 0056-0067, 0079-0100 in the Specification, Figs. 4, 7, 11, etc.

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 11-14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huuskonen (US Publication 2004/0078372) in view of Aholainen (US Patent no. 7,102,640) in view of Nyman (US Patent no. 7,089,298).

Claim 1 is amended to require:

said information processor further executes operations of
storing profile information showing a connection
procedure with said devices of the other party in said storage so
that said profile information can be designated,
retrieving from said storage by said identification
information related to said designated specifying information to
specify a device of the other party, and
performing a connection with the specified device of
the other party by said identification information related to said
designated specifying information, said connection being
performed by a procedure according to said profile information to
be designated.

Paragraph 0043 in Huuskonen discusses:

[0043] WCD 102 stores information from each of these encounters. For example, WCD 102 stores the time of each encounter, information regarding the encountered remote device 104, and information regarding the owner of the encountered remote device 104. In addition, WCD 102 may store whether each encountered remote device 104 is a personal device or an impersonal device. This allows for the efficient retrieval of stored information regarding past encounters.

That is, Huuskonen merely discloses information regarding the encountered remote device 104, information regarding the owner thereof, and storing into WCD 102 information on whether each encountered remote device 104 is a personal or impersonal device.

The language of claim 1 requires "said information processor storing profile information showing a connection procedure with said devices of the other party in said storage so that said profile information can be designated," which is not disclosed either expressly or implicitly by Huuskonen and it is readily apparent that Aholainen and Nyman are silent on this feature and there is no evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art would modify Aholainen, Nyman or Huuskonen to provide the language of amended claim 1.

In addition, paragraphs 0113, 0117 and 0118 in Huuskonen merely discloses as follows:

[0113] In a step 604, the slave device waits for a randomly determined back-off period. Next, in a step 606, the slave device determines whether it has received another inquiry message transmitted by the master device. If this occurs, then the slave device replies to the master device with an inquiry response packet in a step 608. The inquiry response is a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet containing all of the information required by the inquiring device to address the responding device. This information includes clock value of the sender (i.e., the responding device), the sender's correct device access code, and the class-of-device (CoD) field. The access code includes the lower address part (LAP) and the upper address part (UAP) of the sender's Bluetooth Device Address (BD _ADDR), a unique, 48-bit IEEE address that is electronically engraved into each Bluetooth device;

[0117] The master device receives this packet, and in response, transmits a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet to the slave device in a step 616. The FHS packet is used to pass information that allows the slave device to synchronize with the frequency hopping sequence of the master device. For example, the FHS packet contains the master device's BD _ADDR (i.e., its unique identifier). Upon receipt of this FHS packet, the slave device transmits a further packet to confirm receipt of the FHS packet in a step 618. Both the master device and the slave device

enter into a connection state at this point; and

[0118] Upon completion of this paging process, a step 620 is performed. In this step, a link is formed between the master device and the slave device. In particular, the slave device synchronizes its clock to the clock of the master device. Thus, the slave device employs the timing and frequency hopping sequence of the master device. Additionally, the master device transmits a packet to verify that a link has been set up. The slave device confirms this link by sending a packet to the master device.

That is, Huuskonen merely disclosed that the slave device replies to the master device with an inquiry response packet including BD_ADDR in a step 608, the master device transmits a FHS packet including BD_ADDR of the master device to the slave device in a step 616, the slave device transmits a packet to confirm receipt of the FHS packet in a step 618 and both the master device and the slave device enter into a connection state, and in a step 620, a link is formed between the master device and the slave device.

The language of amended claim 1 requires "said information processor ... retrieving from said storage by said identification information related to said designated specifying information to specify a device of the other party, performing a connection with the specified device of the other party by said designated identification information related to said specifying information" and "said connection being performed by a procedure according to said profile information to be designated," which are not disclosed either expressly or implicitly by Huuskonen, Aholainen, and Nyman.

In other words, to reject the claimed "relating said specifying information and said identification information, said connection with said device~~devices~~ of the other party is able to be started by designation of said specifying information," the Office Action relies upon Huuskonen. However, a *prima facie* case of obviousness based upon Huuskonen, Aholainen and Nyman cannot be established, because the Office Action does not rely upon Aholainen and Nyman to reject the above features, and there is no evidence that one skilled in the art would further modify Huuskonen's discussion of how the slave device and the master device connect and discussion about information regarding the encountered remote device 104, information regarding the owner thereof, and storing into WCD 102 information on whether each encountered remote device 104 is a personal or impersonal device, to provide the language of claim 1 "***connection with said device~~devices~~ of the other party is able to be started by designation of said specifying information.***" In addition, the language of claim 1 is amended to clarify use of the specifying information along with "***profile information showing a***

connection procedure" for establishing a connection, namely:

storing profile information showing a connection procedure with said devices of the other party in said storage so that said profile information can be designated,

retrieving from said storage by said identification information related to said designated specifying information to specify a device of the other party, and

performing a connection with the specified device of the other party by said identification information related to said designated specifying information, said connection being performed by a procedure according to said profile information to be designated.

Huuskonen is silent on the language of amended claim 1 "retrieving from said storage by said identification information related to said designated specifying information to specify a device of the other party." Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are amended to require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 7

Independent claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huuskonen, Hama (US Publication 2002/0039915) and Nyman.

Claim 7 is amended to require:

said information processing part further

stores profile information showing a connection procedure with said devices of the other party in said data base part so that said profile information can be designated,

retrieves from said data base part by said proper address information related to said designated specifying information to specify a device of the other party,

connects with the specified device of the other party by said proper address information related to said designated specifying information, said connecting being performed by a procedure according to said profile information to be designated.

For the reasons discussed above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 7 cannot be established based upon Huuskonen, Hama and Nyman. Huuskonen merely discloses in paragraph 0043 information regarding the encountered remote device 104, information regarding the owner thereof, and storing into WCD 102 information whether each encountered remote device 104 is a personal or impersonal device. The language of amended claim 7 requires "said information processor stores profile information showing a connection procedure with said devices of the other party in said data base part so that said profile information can be designated," which is not disclosed either expressly or implicitly by Huuskonen, Hama, and Nyman.

In addition, as discussed above, Huuskonen merely discloses in paragraphs 0113, 0117 and 0118 that the slave device replies to the master device with an inquiry response packet including BD_ADDR in a step 608, the master device transmits a FHS packet including BD_ADDR of the master device to the slave device in a step 616, the slave device transmits a packet to confirm receipt of the FHS packet in a step 618 and both the master device and the slave device enter into a connection state, and in a step 620, a link is formed between the master device and the slave device.

In addition, Hama is relied upon to reject the feature relating to use of "proper address information."

In contrast to Huuskonen, Hama and Nyman, the language of amended claim 7 requires "retrieving from said data base part by said proper address information related to said designated specifying information to specify a device of the other party, said information processor performing a connection with the specified device of the other party by said proper address information related to said designated specifying information" and "said connection being performed by a procedure according to said profile information to be designated," which are not disclosed either expressly or implicitly by Huuskonen, Hama, and Nyman.

Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 7 and allowance of claim 7 is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: September 16, 2009 By: _____

Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501